

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-24, 26-54 and 57-59 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 11, 14, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57 are amended in this paper. New claim 60 is herein presented. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-54 and 57-59 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Phillips In View of Murphy

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a front-end circuit operable to receive a plurality of radio signals transmitted across a frequency band and generate an analog signal simultaneously carrying a plurality of channels within said frequency band; an analog to digital converter operable to convert said analog signal to a digital signal simultaneously carrying said plurality of channels within said frequency band; and a digital processing system operable to receive said digital signal and generate at least one output signal corresponding to at least one of said plurality of channels within said frequency band.

The Examiner concedes that Phillips fails to expressly teach, among other things, a plurality of channels within a frequency band, and a digital processing system operable to generate at least one output signal corresponding to at least one of the plurality of channels. Moreover, the Examiner states only that Murphy discloses a plurality of channels within a frequency band.

The Applicants' attorney respectfully submits that the mere fact that Murphy teaches a plurality of channels within a frequency band hardly provides or supports the motivation required to demonstrate the obviousness of modifying the system of Phillips to generate an analog signal corresponding to a plurality of channels within a frequency band, convert the analog signal to a digital signal, and generate at least one output signal corresponding to at least

one of the plurality of channels within the frequency band as is required by the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, there is no suggestion or teaching offered by the two references as to, nor does the Examiner provide a reference describing or suggesting, how the system of Phillips would be so modified to achieve or include the limitations recited in claim 1. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Additionally, while the radio receiver taught by Phillips is configurable to receive many different kinds of aviation signals (various frequencies, various modulation types, various band widths, and various functions), there is no teaching or suggestion in Phillips that such receiver is capable of simultaneously processing and delivering information from more than one of these signals as is required by claim 1.

The radio receiver described in the instant application is also configurable to receive many different kinds of aviation signals (various frequencies, various modulation types, various band widths, and various functions). However, and in contrast to the teachings of Phillips, receiver described in the instant application is capable of simultaneously processing and delivering information from more than one of these signals at the same time.

As an illustrative example, the receiver of Phillips may be configured to receive AM audio at 118 MHz. The operator may then decide to reconfigure the Phillips radio to perform a different function and may reconfigure it to receive D8PSK (Differential 8 phase shift keying) weather data at 136.975 MHz. The Phillips radio can make this switch, but the moment it becomes a weather data receiver, it ceases being an AM audio receiver.

In contrast, a receiver of the instant invention is fully capable of simultaneously receiving both AM audio at 118 MHz as well as weather data at 136.975, for example. The operator has complete simultaneous performance of both functions. Consequently, an operator who wants to simultaneously receive AM voice at 118 MHz, AM voice at 121.5 MHz, and D8PSK weather data at 136.975 MHz will require THREE receivers of the Phillips type, but would require only ONE receiver of the type described in the instant application.

Claims 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57

Claims 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-9, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 26-28, 30-33, 35-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 58-59

Claims 2-9, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 26-28, 30-33, 35-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 58-59 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the examiner has any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC

/P.G. Scott Born/

P.G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491